

The specific reference provided in the Office Action, with respect to Omori, is Fig. 1, element 16, which is a recording medium that is used to record computer programs (para. [0101]). Therefore, the particular reference as asserted by the Office Action cannot reasonably be considered to teach a memory that stores processing result logs of the processor. The Applicant's disclosure defines processing result logs, as illustrated by Fig. 13, as containing a plurality of identified parameters.

Additionally, the Office Action asserts that Omori teaches a receiver that receives the processing result logs stored in the memory. Specifically, the Office Action refers to page 9, para. [0206], of Omori to support this assertion. This specific reference teaches that the users connection time which is used for charging and time information are used to record a log are the information that is transferred. Again, referring to Fig. 13 of Applicants disclosure, which illustrates the information contained in the processing results log, as recited in the pending claims. Omori teaches that the log contains charging and time information. Therefore, it is unreasonable to consider that Omori teaches processing result logs containing the information illustrated in Fig. 13 of the Applicant's disclosure. The Applicant respectfully submits that Omori does not support a *prima-facie* case of anticipation with respect to the subject matter of the pending claims, as discussed above.


For at least the above reasons, Omori cannot reasonably be considered to teach or even to have suggested, the combinations of all of the features recited in at least independent claims 1, 5, 8, 11 and 15. Further, claims 2-4, 6-8, 9, 12-14 and 16 are also neither taught, nor would they have been suggested, by the applied prior art references for at least the respective dependence of these claims on the allowable independent claims, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the subject matter of claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Omori are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-16 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Kirk D. Berkheimer
Registration No. 59,874

JAO:KDB/jls

Date: May 10, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--